

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

<b>WILLIE FRANK WRIGHT, JR.,</b>	:	
	:	
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	<b>NO. 5:10-CV-272 (CAR)</b>
	:	
<b>VS.</b>	:	
	:	
	:	
<b>OFFICER LANGFORD, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	<b>Proceedings Under 42 U.S.C. §1983</b>
	:	<b>Before the U.S. Magistrate Judge</b>
<b>Defendants.</b>	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

Defendant Officer Langford has filed a Motion for Summary Judgment asserting that Plaintiff Willie Frank Wright, Jr. has failed to demonstrate the existence of any genuine issue of material fact with respect to any of his claims. Doc. 26. Since Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the Court deems it appropriate and necessary to advise him of his obligation to respond to said motion and of the consequences which he may suffer if he fails to file a proper response.

Plaintiff is advised:

1. that a Motion for Summary Judgment has been filed herein;
2. that he has an right to oppose this motion; and,
3. that if he fails to oppose the motion, it may be GRANTED.

Plaintiff is further advised that, under the procedures and policies of this court, motions for summary judgment are normally decided on briefs. That is, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court will examine the pleadings, discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits filed by the parties to determine whether there are any genuine issues of material fact and, by extension, whether or not the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. In view of this procedure, Plaintiff is hereby notified that if he fails or refuses to respond to and rebut the statements set forth in the Defendant's affidavits or other sworn pleadings, said statements may be accepted as the truth.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED AND DIRECTED** to file a response to the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment **WITHIN TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS** of his RECEIPT of this Order. Upon the filing of such response and any reply thereto, or after the passage of fifty (50) days from the date of this Order, whichever comes first, the Court will proceed with its consideration of the motion.

**SO ORDERED**, this 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.

s/ Charles H. Weigle  
Charles H. Weigle  
United States Magistrate Judge